

3024

YET CHONG ELECTRIC COMPANY

BLK C-4, 13/F, WING HING IND.BLDG., 14 HING YIP ST., KWUN TONG, KLN, H.K.
 TEL : (852) 23440137 FAX : (852) 23419016
 Home page: www.ycec.com Email: lzm@ycec.com

United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Art Unit 3644 Examiner
 Mr. Dinh, Tien Quang

Re: US Patent Application No. 10/029,951

Fax: 1 703 306 4195

Dear Mr. Dinh

Thanks for given me 6 months for the second defenses.

But in your second argument on the writing of examination, there are too many places that i do not understanding, therefore i do seek for your advice!

1. In above-mentioned argue writing of page5 (the line of 11th):

『 Garehime discloses an aircraft anti-hijacking system having a concealed monitoring device to deter potential hijackers but lacks the system to ... 』

① But, in the Garehime's invention the word of "concealed" that was no find?

2. In above-mentioned argue writing of page5 (the line of 17th):

『 ...Feher discloses means to monitor the aircraft from the ground as well as "Flight Trajectory Calibrator 80" are well known in the art.... 』

① But, the "Flight Trajectory Calibrator 80" of previous art. in Feher's invention that was no find?

3. In above-mentioned argue writing of page5 (the line of 18th):

『 Borthayre discloses a system to take control away from the cockpit to the ground system via a special frequency band is well known in the art. Borthayre inherently has a flight trajectory calibrator system to know where the aircraft is and going so it can control the aircraft. 』

① But, the "special frequency band" and "flight trajectory calibrator system" in Borthayre's invention that was no find the words?

① The Borthayre's invention lacked the "remote-controlled automatic/semautomatic steering" and that was very important in the art. !

4. In above-mentioned argue writing of page7 (the line of 4th):

『 Garehime as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre discloses all claimed parts of the invention except for the narcotic sprayer used to put terrorists to sleep. However, Boudreau discloses the use of narcotic sprayers is well known in the art. 』

① But, why the narcotic sprayer was no find in any previous art. by your search report? Boudreau, Who is he and how well does he know in the art.?

Why was there so much mistakes in the writing of examination? Inventor thought that this should not be coming from professional level of Examiner ! Therefore inventor wants to ask Mr.Dinh can reply instruction!

From following chart, the invent's novelty of claim cannot be neglected by any reason, inventor doubted that there had been a shameful backstage force wanting to use the administrative means oppression Examiner make to exclude to eliminate the application of inventor:

The "single person checkroom" is a new and useful process than the previous invention, the Claim of 1a & 2-6 novelty can confirm by the comparison:

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 27 2003

Lin's single person checkroom	Special beams of raster curtain for test	"Unidirectional" bullet-proof glass	Double door program setting system	weight means	Five-finger mold hand test	Voice recognition	Image test
Lin's Novelty	novelty	Unidirectional	novelty	<u>a new use of a known process</u>	novelty	novelty	novelty
Zerick's checkroom	no	bullet-proof glass	no	no		no	no
Jacoby et al's	no	no	no	no	out-of-date	no	no
Anastassakis	no	no	no	different field	no	no	no

The Claim of 1 b-c & 7-9 novelty can confirm by the comparisons

Lin's invention	<u>concealed monitoring device!</u>	<u>flight trajectory calibrator system</u>	<u>Remote-controlled automatic/semiautomatic steering</u>	<u>narcotic sprayers</u>	power supply of independent and concealed
Lin's novelty	<u>concealed no precedent</u>	have no precedent	Have no precedent	have no precedent	Have no precedent
Garehime	<u>monitoring device!</u>				no
Borthayre		The story is make up			no
Borthayre			not exist		no
Boudreau				Who is he?	no

Inventor asked for fair treatment and hopes that Mr. Dinh will pay attention- especially to the fact that the original two dotted lines and the two line that go between Fig. 1f & Fig. 4f was being omitted from reason why did the P. C of RABIN & BERDO. not file its reply before the deadline of Nov.14, 2002 points out that they are secretly trying to make the inventor unable to get the patent to ! Why must the inventor have to file it with speed post on his own? Examiner, Mr. Tien Quang Dinh, was an eyewitness that it is not an accidental incident but rather a violation of professional ethics.

In this case, Inventor can offer the application of Agent's letter by ShenZhen of china only, Examiner refer to inventor in addition that it will have what can do still? Please in view the attached list of <http://www.ycec.com/Defense-230903.htm> and glance over the letter and amendment and to instruction the inventor how to makes the defense more perfectly!

Please reply by Email to lzmmyc@singnet.com.sg, ycec@163.net, lzm@ycec.com.

Thank you for your Kind attention.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 29 2003

Sincerely yours,

Zhen-Man Lin

Attach <http://www.ycec.com/Defense-230903.htm>

~~OFFICIAL~~

attach 1	www.ycec.com/us-office-250603.tif	
attach 2	Amendment (draft)	12-09-03
	News figure: Fig1. Fig.2 Fig.3 Fig.4 Fig.5 Fig.6	14-09-03
attach 3	ShenZhen Agent Letter Old-Fig.1 & Fig.4	15-07-03
attach 4	CN1408608A Figure 1-5	09-04-03